UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
Alexander

If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

Official Business Penalty For Private Use, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EI

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

CENTER ZIP CODE 22314

10019-6127 1 904 C 40 12/01/05 RTN TO SEND

RETURN TO SENDER

bobbahallanlahiahlahlahlahlahlahlahlahlah

10166+0008 2231521420



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/679,541	10/06/2003	Rick Chin	6175-059	3306	
7590 11/28/2005		EXAMINER			
Clifford Chance US LLP			WOODS, ERIC V		
200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166-0153			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
rew Tork, 141	10100 0133		2672		
			DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/679,541	CHIN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Eric V. Woods	2672		

	Eric V. Woods	2672	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or	the same day as filing a Notice of	of Appeal. To avoid aba	andonment of
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	midavit, or other evider a compliance with 37 C	FR 41.31; or (3)
a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:		nust be med within one	of the jollowing
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing dat	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	later than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the ilital rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	'06.07(t).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of euunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the	dension and the corresponding amout	it of the fee. The appropr	iale exterision lee
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late	r than three months after the mailing of	late of the final rejection,	even if timely filed,
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b	<i>j.</i>		
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must b	e filed within two mont	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissai of tr	ie appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a prior	er, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	onsideration and/or search (see in	OTE below),	
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) They are not deemed to place the application in be	ow), otter form for anneal by materially	reducina or simplifyina	the issues for
anneal: and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally r	ejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.	116 and 41.33(a)).		(570) 00 ()
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-0	Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):·		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	illowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		will be entered and an	explanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ovided below or appended.		
Claim(s) allowed:		,	
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:		•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ut before or on the date of filing a	Notice of Anneal will no	nt he entered
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the aπid	avit or other evidence is	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome all rejections under app	eai and/or appellant la	iis to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attacl	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
13. Other:			
		·	
•		,	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims add new limitations concerning having the layout appear in various windows. This limitation would clearly require further search and consideration and changes the scope of the claims. Specifically, claim 7 was amended in such a way that the scope was significantly changed, and it cannot be entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are directed in part to the amended claims. These were not entered, therefore that portion of the arguments is moot. Applicant has engaged also in piecemeal attacks on the references. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Attacks on motivation to combine are found in only the last two sentences of the last paragraph of Remarks page 7 and are therefore spurious. Examiner will provide a further explanation of the rejection in the Examiner's Answer, which will *not* be a new grounds of rejection, because it was previously made, but will be a clarification of examiner's prior position. Examiner further disagrees with applicant's characterization of the Venner analysis, because examiner fully believes that later Federal Circuit cases have shown that that doctrine is extendable. Further, examiner was not stating that such analysis was relevant to the transformative matrices per se, but rather to their use and application in shifting drawing views as per the references of record. All of the above notwithstanding, applicant's representative is encouraged to call examiner to discuss possible claim amendments.

affry a. Brun